



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/594,816	06/16/2000	Jonas Andersson	040071-079	1951

21839 7590 06/30/2003

BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

CHIANG, JACK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

8
DATE MAILED: 06/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



54
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) JACK CHIANG (Examiner) (3) MR. Jonas Anderson (Inventor)
(2) MR. Michael G. Savage (4) _____

Date of Interview: 6-18-03

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

☒ See attach sheet

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed: Rabe

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

See attach sheet

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

JACK CHIANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

INTERVIEW SUMMARY


1. On 05 June 2003, an interview was set up between Mr. Savage and the examiner.

The main subject matter that was discussed is whether or not Rabe and Warnke have an acoustic horn having an acoustic impedance matched with impedances of an ear and the driver. An agreement can not be reached on that day, and the examiner has suggested to invite the inventor to explain the above issue.

2. On 18 June 2003, an interview is set up between Mr. Anderson (inventor), Mr.

Savage and the examiner. Mr. Anderson has explained that the normal procedures from designing a phone to manufacturing the phone basically involve: designing the phone on paper, building a prototype, testing the prototype by using an Ear Simulator to ensure that the acoustic impedance of the phone matches with the impedances of the ear (Ear Simulator) and the driver, then manufacturing the phone.

Mr. Anderson is from Ericsson, and the Rabe reference is an Ericsson patent. Rabe has been discussed extensively during the interview. Mr. Anderson and the examiner agrees that Rabe's speaker design having an acoustic impedance matched with impedances of an ear and the driver, at least in the aspect of the frequency response. Mr. Anderson and the examiner also agree that the design of the Rabe's speaker is different from Mr. Anderson's design. Further, Mr. Savage is informed that the definition of the horn provided in the amendment filed on 04 March 2003 reads on Rabe's speaker design.


JACK CHIANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER